



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,030	06/20/2003	Kelvin S. Varti	RA 5482	7121

7590 11/13/2006

Beth L. McMahon
Unisys Corporation
MS 4773
P O Box 64942
St. Paul, MN 55164

EXAMINER

PEUGH, BRIAN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2187

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,030

Applicant(s)

VARTTI ET AL.

Examiner

Brian R. Peugh

Art Unit

2187

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,12-16,19-24,29-32 and 34-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,7-11,17,18,25-28,33,37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication filed September 6, 2006 in response to PTO Office Action dated June 7, 2006. The applicant's remarks and amendment to the specification and/or claims were considered with the results that follow.

Claims 1-37 have been presented for examination in this application. In response to the last Office Action, claims 1, 12, 20, 29, and 34 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-16, 19-24, 29-32 and 34-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haupt et al. (US# 6,434,641), Rosenbluth et al. (US# 6,973,550), and Bertone (US# 6,546,465).

Regarding claim 1, Haupt et al. teaches **for use in a system having multiple processors in a processing node** [System Platform (100) is interpreted as the

processing node as claimed] **coupled to a memory [Fig. 1], a method, comprising:**
a.) receiving multiple requests for data from the multiple processors; b.) if ones
of the multiple requests are requesting the same data, creating a respective
linked list in the processing node to record the ones of the multiple requests; and
c.) issuing ... requests recorded by each linked list from the processing node to
the memory [col. 1, line 1-14; col. 17, lines 12-17; col. 19, lines 48-50 & 27-32].

However, Haupt et al. fails to teach **issuing one of the requests recorded by**
each linked list from the processing node to the memory. Rosenbluth et al. teaches
this issuing one of the requests recorded by each linked list from the processing node to
the memory [col. 2, line 64 col. 3, line 18; col. 7, lines 48-50].

However, Haupt et al. and Rosenbluth fail to teach the linking step **without**
regard to types of the requests. Bertone teaches creating linked lists directed
towards the same memory line without regard to the type of memory request [col. 4,
lines 24-28].

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the
teachings of Haupt et al., Rosenbluth et al., and Bertone before him at the time the
invention was made to modify the request linking system of Haupt et al. to include the
linking system of Rosenbluth et al., because then the retrieval of future data will be
coherent (col. 2, lines 56-63), as well include the linking system of Bertone, because
then unnecessary memory requests could be eliminated (col. 4, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 2, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein each linked list orders requests in order of receipt, and wherein the issued request is the oldest pending request** [col. 19, lines 23-32].

Regarding claim 4, Haupt et al. teaches **receiving requested data from the memory; if the received data was requested by requests recorded in a linked list, providing the received data to a processor that issued a predetermined one of the requests included in the linked list; removing the predetermined request from the linked list; and processing all requests remaining in the linked list** [col. 19, line 48 – col. 20, line 8].

Regarding claim 5, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the predetermined request is the oldest-pending request in the linked list** [col. 12, lines 50-53].

Regarding claim 6, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the processing step includes: making the next request in the linked list the current request; requesting return of the received data from whichever one of the multiple processors last retained the data; providing the received data to whichever one of the multiple processors is indicated by the current request; and removing the current request from the linked list** [col. 17, lines 10-34; see also col. 9, lines 35-42 for return operation description].

Regarding claim 12, Haupt et al. teaches **a method for processing requests generated by requesters and provided to a memory including: a.) receiving a request for data stored in a memory; b.) if the request is requesting the same data as another pending request that has not yet been provided from the requesters to the memory, linking the request to the other pending request; and c.) repeating steps a.) and b.) for any additional requests issued to the memory** [col. 6, line 1-14; col. 17, lines 12-17; col. 19, lines 48-50 & 27-32].

However, Haupt et al. fails to teach linking the request to the other pending request **before either of the requests is provided by the requesters to the memory.** Rosenbluth et al. teaches this linking before either of the requests is provided by the requesters to the memory [col. 2, line 64 col. 3, line 18; col. 7, lines 48-50].

However, Haupt et al. and Rosenbluth fail to teach the linking step **without regard to types of the requests.** Bertone teaches creating linked lists directed towards the same memory line without regard to the type of memory request [col. 4, lines 24-28].

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Haupt et al., Rosenbluth et al., and Bertone before him at the time the invention was made to modify the request linking system of Haupt et al. to include the linking system of Rosenbluth et al., because then the retrieval of future data will be coherent (col. 2, lines 56-63), as well include the linking system of Bertone, because then unnecessary memory requests could be eliminated (col. 4, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 13, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein steps a.) through c.) include creating multiple linked lists of requests, each respectively associated with different data** [col. 19, lines 23-32].

Regarding claim 14, Haupt et al. teaches **d.) when data for the pending request is received from the memory, providing the data to a requester that issued the pending request; and e.) if the pending request is linked to any other request, requesting that the data be returned by a requester indicated by the pending request so that the any other linked request may be processed.** [col. 17, lines 10-34; see also col. 9, lines 35-42 for return operation description].

Regarding claim 15, Haupt et al. teaches **f.) providing the data to satisfy the linked request** [col. 19, lines 50-56].

Regarding claim 16, Haupt et al. teaches **further including: g.) making the linked request the current request; h.) if the current request is linked to a request, requesting that the data be returned by a requester that most recently retained the data; i.) providing returned data to satisfy the linked request; and j.) repeating steps g.) through i.) for any additional requests in the linked list** [col. 19, line 48 – col. 20, line 8].

Regarding claim 19, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein at least one of steps e.) and h.) is performed in a manner that is determined programmably** [return operations are programmed to initiate the defer CAM logic (702) operations; col. 17, lines 24-34].

Regarding claim 20, Haupt et al. teaches **a system for processing requests to a memory, comprising: multiple requesters in a processing node to issue requests for data** [col. 6, lines 1-14; col. 17, lines 12-17]; **a request tracking circuit in the processing node [MSU 110 contains CAM 702] to retain a record of each request until the request is completed, and to associate a request with any other one or more requests for the same data** [col. 19, lines 48-50 & 27-32].

However, Haupt fails to teach associating a request with any other one of the requests for the same data **so that a single request for any given data is pending from the processing node to the memory at a given time**. Rosenbluth et al. teaches a single request for any given data is pending from the processing node to the memory at a given time [col. 2, line 64 col. 3, line 18; col. 7, lines 48-50].

However, Haupt et al. and Rosenbluth fail to teach the linking step **irrespective of types of the requests**. Bertone teaches creating linked lists directed towards the same memory line without regard to the type of memory request [col. 4, lines 24-28].

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Haupt et al., Rosenbluth et al., and Bertone before him at the time the invention was made to modify the request linking system of Haupt et al. to include the linking system of Rosenbluth et al., because then the retrieval of future data will be

coherent (col. 2, lines 56-63), as well include the linking system of Bertone, because then unnecessary memory requests could be eliminated (col. 4, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 21, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the request tracking circuit includes a storage device to store multiple requests for the same data in a respective linked list of requests** [Defer CAM Logic (622) contains CAM 702].

Regarding claim 22, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the request tracking circuit includes a control circuit to receive data from the memory, and to provide the received data to one of the multiple requesters based on information stored within the storage device** [col. 6, lines 25-29].

Regarding claim 23, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein if the received data is received in response to a request that has been associated with other requests, the control circuit provides the received data to whichever requester issued the oldest one of the associated requests, and processes each of the other associated requests in the order in which the other associated requests were recorded by the request tracking circuit** [col. 19, lines 48-56 & 27-32].

Regarding claim 24, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the control circuit includes circuits to process each of the other associated requests by attempting to obtain the received data from one of the multiple requesters, then providing any**

obtained data to a requester that is identified by the request that is being processed [col. 17, lines 10-34; see also col. 9, lines 35-42 for return operation description].

Regarding claim 29, Haupt et al. teaches a **data processing system comprising: a memory [235] a processing node [250] coupled to the memory and having one or more requesters to generate requests [col. 17, lines 12-17] for data to the memory, wherein the processing node includes a requesting tracking circuit [520] to associate requests issued for the same data [col. 19, line 48- col. 20, line 8; col. 19, lines 28-30].**

However, Haupt fails to teach **to allow only one of the requests for the same data from being issued to the memory at a given time** Rosenbluth et al. teaches to allow only one of the requests for the same data from being issued to the memory at a given time [col. 2, line 64 col. 3, line 18; col. 7, lines 48-50].

However, Haupt et al. and Rosenbluth fail to teach the linking step **without regard to types of the requests**. Bertone teaches creating linked lists directed towards the same memory line without regard to the type of memory request [col. 4, lines 24-28].

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Haupt et al., Rosenbluth et al., and Bertone before him at the time the invention was made to modify the request linking system of Haupt et al. to include the linking system of Rosenbluth et al., because then the retrieval of future data will be

coherent (col. 2, lines 56-63), as well include the linking system of Bertone, because then unnecessary memory requests could be eliminated (col. 4, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 30, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the processing node includes multiple processors [510; col. 10, lines 28-37], and wherein the requesting tracking circuit includes (comprises) a control circuit to receive data returned from the memory, the control circuit to provide the data to the processor associated with the oldest request pending for the data [col. 15, lines 28-42].**

Regarding claim 31, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the control circuit includes a circuit [622] to determine whether other requests are pending for the received data, and for each of the other pending requests, attempting to obtain the data from whichever of the multiple processors last retained the data, then providing any obtained data to a processor that is associated with the request being processed [col. 17, lines 10-34; see also col. 9, lines 35-42 for return operation description].**

Regarding claim 32, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the control circuit processes the multiple requests for the received data in an order in which the multiple requests were received [col. 19, lines 23-32].**

Regarding claim 34, Haupt et al. teaches **a system for processing requests to a memory, including: processing means [120] for originating the requests to the memory; and request tracking means for receiving the requests, and for forming an association between any of the requests that are requesting the same data,** [col. 17, lines 12-17; col. 19, lines 48-50 & 27-32].

However, Haupt fails to teach **allowing only one of the associated requests to be provided from the processing means to the memory** Rosenbluth et al. teaches this allowing only one of the associated requests to be provided from the processing means to the memory [col. 2, line 64 col. 3, line 18; col. 7, lines 48-50].

However, Haupt et al. and Rosenbluth fail to teach the linking step **irrespective of types of the requests**. Bertone teaches creating linked lists directed towards the same memory line without regard to the type of memory request [col. 4, lines 24-28].

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Haupt et al., Rosenbluth et al., and Bertone before him at the time the invention was made to modify the request linking system of Haupt et al. to include the linking system of Rosenbluth et al., because then the retrieval of future data will be coherent (col. 2, lines 56-63), as well include the linking system of Bertone, because then unnecessary memory requests could be eliminated (col. 4, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 35, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the association records an order of receipt of the requests that are requesting the same data** [col. 19, lines 23-32].

Regarding claim 36, Haupt et al. teaches **wherein the request tracking means includes control means for receiving data from the memory, and if the received data was requested by associated requests that are requesting the same data, for processing each of the associated requests in the order in which the requests were received** [col. 15, lines 28-42; col. 19, lines 48-53].

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 7-11, 17, 18, 25-28, 33, and 37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-16, 19-24, 29-32, and 34-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian R. Peugh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00am to 4:30pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday's from 7:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks, can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 2187

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Brian R. Peugh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2187
November 7, 2006